

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 10-20705

ALI DARWICH,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS STATEMENT AND  
MOTION FOR SHOW CAUSE HEARING TO SUPPORT MOTION TO SUPPRESS**

Before the court are two related motions filed pro se by Defendant Ali Darwich: a motion to suppress and a motion for a show cause hearing in support of his motion to suppress. The Government has indicated its opposition to the motions. (See Dkt. # 170.) The court will deny both motions.

In his motion to suppress, Defendant argues that the Government and its agents lied under oath and "change[d]" and "muniplate[d]" Defendant's May 2009 statement. Defendant asserts he never lied to the Government and intimates that the Government is committing fraud upon the court in order to "protect the mafia." (Dkt. # 164 at 2.) Similarly, in his motion for a show cause hearing, Defendant requests a hearing to show that the Government, and particularly Agent Milan "lied under textimone even under Oath and change Defendant Statement From the true to Lie." (Dkt. # 172 at 1.)

In essence, Defendant seeks to challenge the court's conclusions in its April 7, 2011, order denying his motion to dismiss the indictment or, in the alternative, to limit the admissibility of any statements made to law enforcement officials. (Dkt. # 143.)

Criminal motions are governed by the same guidelines as civil motions. E.D. Mich. LCrR 12.1(a). Motions seeking reconsideration of earlier orders of the court “must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties and other persons entitled to be heard on the motion have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.” E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(h)(3). Defendant has failed to do so here. Instead, he attempts to relitigate issues upon which the court has already ruled. However, “the court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication.” *Id.* Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the Defendant’s motion to suppress [Dkt. # 164] and motion for a show cause hearing in support of his motion to suppress [Dkt. # 172] are DENIED.

S/Robert H. Cleland  
ROBERT H. CLELAND  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: May 17, 2011

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record on this date, May 17, 2011, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Lisa Wagner  
Case Manager and Deputy Clerk  
(313) 234-5522